

*Origin of the Baloch.*—By COLONEL E. MOCKLER, *Political Agent, Muscat.*<sup>1</sup>

[Read November 1893.]

Professor Rawlinson derives the name of the “Baloch” from Belus, king of Babylon, who is identified with Nimrod, the son of Cush, and says that “the names of Belus and Cush, thus brought into juxtaposition have remained attached to some portion or other of the region in question from ancient times to the present day. The country East of Kirman was called Kusem throughout the Sassanian period. The same region is now Beloochistan, the country of the Beloochees or Belus, whilst adjoining it to the East, is Cutch or Kooch.” With the name of Cush may be yoked “Kech” (the capital of Makrān), “Kachī” (a province of Baloochistan) and “Cashmere”; and, as the Sindhīs call the Baloch, “Barōc”, “Kach and Baroch” (Cutch and Broach of our maps) may be linked together.

The country now called Balochistan was called by the Greeks “Gedrosia” and was inhabited on the seacoast by the “Ichthyophagi” (fish-eaters) and on the North-West by the Paricanii, Utii, Maki and other tribes. One of the tribes or clans now inhabiting it, *viz.*, the Rind tribe (whose name signifies a “turbulent, reckless, daring man”)—which, it may be noted, has never acknowledged the authority of any ruler in the country, and each individual member of which professes to owe obedience to no one, so that the tribe has no recognised head—assert that they originally came from “Alaf,” which is supposed by themselves and most other people, I fancy, who have heard their tradition, to be Haleb or Aleppo in Syria. They say that they are Arabs of the tribe of Quraish and were forced to the number of 40,000 to emigrate from “Alaf” by Yazīd I, for having rendered assistance to Ḥusain “the martyr,” nephew of the prophet Muḥammad, in A. H. 61. There is a popular ballad well-known throughout the whole country to that effect which, however, states that from “Alaf” to Makrān

<sup>1</sup> [This article has not had the benefit of revision by the author. Names of well-known places and tribes are given in the conventional spelling of the maps. Thus Baloch and not Balōc. ED.]

they travelled between "earth and heaven." The name of not one single place between Aleppo and Makrān, as having been halted at by the 40,000 Rinds who are said to have left "Alaf" in a body is preserved, so far as I am aware, in any tradition in the whole country, although, from the Western border of Makrān itself, from the seacoast to some 150 miles inland, their movements eastwards are minutely recorded in various ballads and oral traditions. These Rinds claim to be the true Baloch, and to one of their ancestors named Jalāl Khān, or rather to one of his sons, whose names are made to suit the exigencies of each clan, the pedigree-makers of almost every clan in Makrān, claiming to be respectable, are pretty certain to trace their clans' descent. Pottinger records the fact that, in his day the Brahuis (who are Dravidian Cushites) claimed descent from the earliest Muḥammadan invaders of Persia, by whom the Rinds are doubtless intended.

The Kalmatīs of Kalmat (the Kalama of Arian and others) make a man named Kalmat their ancestor, a Rind, and one of the four sons of Jalāl Khān. Some of the genealogists of the great Hōt or Ōt tribe also, whom I identify with the Utii of the army of Xerxes (though many in the tribe, and most out of it, deny any connection with the Rinds, except in a few families by marriage,) say that a man named Hōt (sometimes called Nōt, sometimes Nōtbandag) was their ancestor, was one of the four sons of Jalāl Khān, and was a Rind. That some families in most of the Baloch clans, in nearly all, perhaps, are related by marriage to the Rinds is quite possible as will hereafter become apparent; but I doubt if very free intermarriage between many clans and them, has at any time been prevalent.

Among the earliest mention of Makrān and the Baloch with which I am acquainted are various passages in the Shāh-nāma of Firdūsī (compiled about A. D. 1000 by command of King Maḥmūd of Ghaznī, who is said to have ordered all available resources to be placed at the disposal of the author) in which it is stated that Kai Khusrū (about B. C. 550) King of Persia passed through Makrān and killed the king of the country, also that Naushīrwān (about A. D. 550) inflicted punishment on the Baloch. Bilāthurī who is said to have died in A. H. 279, mentions that a tribe called the "Qufṣ" aided the people of Kirmān against the Arab marauders.

Tabarā who wrote in A. H. 308, also relates that the people of Kirmān asked aid of a people called by the Arabs قفص *Qufṣ* and by the Persians كوج *Kūj* or *Kēj* (of which there is also a reading كفج *Kufij*.)

Ibn Haukal who appears to have written in A. H. 360, and of whose work there are, it is said, only two copies in Europe, writes "to the

“ East of Kirmān lies Makrān and the deserts of that country and  
 “ Bahrain, on the borders of the Balūj. The mountains of قفص *Qufṣ*  
 “ lie on the southern border (of Kirmān) near the sea. On the East  
 “ is خواس *Khawās* and the desert extending towards قفص *Qufṣ*,  
 “ and on the South is Balūj. The بلوج *Balūj* (this appears to be a  
 “ quotation) are in the desert of mount قفص *Qufṣ* in the Persian  
 “ language كوج *Kūj* or *Kōj*, and they call the two peoples كوج *Kūj*  
 “ or *Kōj* and بلوج *Balūj* or *Balōj*.

In the *Tarīkh i Guzīda*,” A. H. 730, it is recorded that in the year  
 A. H. 22, ‘Abdu-l-lāh bin ‘Amar bin Rabī invaded Kirmān and took  
 possession of its capital, Kuwāshīr, so that the inhabitants solicited  
 assistance of the men of “ Kūj and Balūj ” in vain. He then after con-  
 quering Sīstān overran Makrān and defeated the king of Sindah, who  
 came to assist in opposing him.

In the *Rauzatu-ṣ-ṣafā* the mountains of the “ Kōc wa Balōc ”  
 are also mentioned; also very particularly by Abū-l-fidā who gives the  
 exact pronunciation of each name. These historians, or rather some  
 of them, it is proper to mention, say that the قفص و بلوص *Qufṣ* and  
*Balūṣ* or كوج و بلوج *Kūj* and *Balūj* claim to be of Arab descent, but  
 it must be remembered that they all wrote several centuries after the  
 commencement of the Muḥammadan era, and that the claim so recorded  
 by them, may be fairly considered as a traditional one put forward in  
 their day as now, by, we will say, a majority of the inhabitants.

It, however, appears from the few authorities quoted that the Baloch  
 were established in Makrān more than a century before the commence-  
 ment of the Muḥammadan era; certainly so if, as Firdūsī relates, Nau-  
 shīrwān punished them in Makrān, and still more certainly that they  
 were located there within 22 years after its commencement; and that  
 therefore if the Rinds left Aleppo in the time of Yazīd I, say (A. H. 61),  
 according to their tradition the Baloch were in Makrān before that date.

It appears to me doubtful that the Rinds ever came from Aleppo,  
 or that they are Baloch at all. Had they come from Aleppo, some history  
 of their journey thence, through Persia—some one incident, out of many  
 which must have occurred to them on such a journey—the name of some  
 one place, at least, at which they halted on that journey—would surely  
 have been handed down to posterity. Who then are these Rinds from  
 “ Alaf ”? Whence this tradition of theirs? And why has a con-  
 nection with them been at any time considered honorific by the inhabi-  
 tants of Makrān?

I reply—that, as early as A. H. 15 at any rate, expeditions were  
 inaugurated, and indeed despatched by the Arabs of ‘Umān (‘Omān)  
 against the frontiers of India, and it is recorded by Tabarī, that Al

Hajjāj, the then governor of Irāk, about A. H. 65, appointed Sa'id bin Aslam bin Zurā al Kalabī to Makrān and its frontiers, and that he was killed by Mua'wiyah and Muḥammad, the sons of Al Hāriṣ al 'Alāfī, viz., Al Hāriṣ of the 'Alāfī tribe. The pedigree of the founder of the tribe is then given as follows:—

اسم علف هو ريان بن حلوان بن عمران بن الحاف بن قضاعة

that is to say they were the descendants of a man called 'Alāf who was a descendant in a direct line from a well-known personage named Quzā'a of Kahtanic stock. Sa'id bin Aslam was opposed by these two brothers (sons of Al Hāriṣ of the 'Alāfī tribe) because he had killed a relation and fellow-countryman of theirs. They had come from 'Umān ('Omān) and after killing Sa'id they took possession of Makrān.

Subsequently Al Hajjāj appears to have sent a strong force against them, before which, although they are said to have been the victors, they retired, about A. H. 86, into Sindh, where their name is conspicuous in the annals of that country for the next two hundred years or so.

These and many other recorded facts regarding these 'Alāfī and their doings, tally so well with the traditions regarding the earliest movements, in Makrān, of the Rinds and some few clans, which really were, or had become, more or less closely connected with them (some of whom I believe to have been also Arabs and some others probably foreign to Makrān), give me grounds for expressing a belief that the Rinds are, as they assert, of Arab descent, not indeed a people who emigrated from the town of Alaf = Haleb = Aleppo in Syria, but a people descended from a man named 'Alāf i.e., a tribe called the 'Alāfī, of 'Umān ('Omān.) Not Quraish, who are Ishmaelites, but 'Alāfī, who are Kahtanites. The Baloch, and the Arabs for that matter, are fond of philological discussions as to the origin and meanings of names, and, given a name, they will certainly find a history and meaning for it; and being some of them Alafī, viz., 'Alafī, or descended from them, their derivation of the name is probably founded on no better authority than their own fancy or that of their ballad makers. The ballad was composed, I believe, within the last 200 years, or less, and the migration from Haleb = Alaf was not improbably suggested by some of the many Makrānīs who have taken service in Mesopotamia and to whom the name of Haleb = Alaf = Aleppo was familiar, and it was a very likely one for them to hit upon.

As regards the status of the Rinds, it will be readily understood, that as the whole of the tribes of Balochistan have adopted the Muḥammadan religion, they are not unwilling to be believed to be related to a people of undoubted Arab descent; who were certainly amongst the

first propagandists of their present faith in the country, *viz.*, the Kahtanite 'Alāfi of 'Umān, who now very naturally claim to have belonged to the Quraish, the most honourable tribe amongst Muḥammadans. In Elliot's History of India will be found the genealogy of the Jaṭs and Baloch (linked together) from Muḥammad, son of Hārūn Mukrānī (Mukrīsnū), a grandson of Muḥammad, son of Abān, son of 'Abdu-rahmān, son of Hamza, son of 'Abdu-l-mattab. But as Hamza had no sons by any daughter of man, 'Abdu-rahmān's mother is conveniently stated to have been a fairy (*this is their Quraish descent*). Muḥammad son of Hārūn is said to have had 50 sons, by 7 wives, the name of *three* of which sons is Jalāl (and Makrān is said to have been divided between the sons of one of these three Jalāls after the death of Al Hajjāj), the sons of his 6th and 7th wives are said to have borne the following names—VI, Fatimah, bore 1 Shēr, 2 Kōh, 3 Buland, 4 Gurg, 5 Nūru-d-dīn, 6 Ḥasan, 7 Ḥusain, 8 Sulaimān, 9 Ibrāhīm; VII, Eve, bore 1 'Ālam, 2 'Alī, 3 Sarkash, 4 Bahādūr, 5 Tēghzan, 6 Mubārak, 7 Turk, 8 Zalha, 9 'Arābī, 10 Shirāz, 11 Tāju-d-dīn, 12 Gulistān Barg. Comment on these names appears unnecessary, but I have no doubt that a certain Jalāl Khān is a historical personage.

Cākar Khān, a descendant of Jalāl Khān and one of the most renowned chiefs of the Rinds, is positively stated, in the traditions and ballads of the country, to have taken Delhi after leaving Makrān (a statement I will now pass by.) The following is a traditional list of the Rind tribe, which Cākar Khān is said to have left behind him in Makrān, starting on the expedition which then led to that event.

The Rēkī (went to Dehgwārān), the *Jaṭ*, *Lattī* (said to be the same as the *Kalmatī*) *Nōhānī*, *Kurd*, *Gabōd* (or *Gabōl*), *Mahīrī*, *Askānī*, *Gādon*, *Marastānī* (stayed in Kolwāh), the *Pūzh* (in Kōlāñc) the *Lāshārī* (in Lashār) the *Barr*, *Cānda*, *Marrī*, *Lāngā*, *Zahrī*, *Sasūdi*, *Kalkalī*, *Damūnī*, *Birdī*, (same as *Gōjah*) *Gōrgēj*, *Lōhānī*, *Siāhpād*, *Kōs-ag*, *Lagōr*, *Balī*, *Lātik*, *Bāmanī*, *Rēganī*, *Dodāi*, *Sābikī*, *Pandaran*. These formed part of his following, and having elected to remain behind, afterwards dispersed into different parts of the country. The names in italics, it is sufficiently evident, are not those of Arabs.

The *Gōrgēj* were probably Georgians. The *Kōs-ag* and *Marrī*, judging by their names, were probably Arabs (in the time of the Khālifa Hashām, A. H. 105–125, Junaid son of 'Abdu-rahmān al Marrī was appointed to the Indian frontier). The *Gabōl* I believe to be an aboriginal and Cushite tribe, "straight-haired Ethiopians." The *Hōt* or *Ōt* have been previously mentioned and identified with the *Utii* of Herodotus and other authors, who were also, I think, not impossibility the same with the *Jaṭs* and *Zothali* and *Yucchi* (both *Jaṭs* and *Meds* are still plentiful in the country).

The Kalmatī are the principal inhabitants of Kalmat and Pasni.

The Lattī are said to be Kalmatī under another name.

The Bulaidī may possibly be descendants of an Arab named Budail, two letters of his name having been transposed in a very common manner; *e. g.*, “aps” for “asp” (horse) “ushtur” for “shutur” (camel) “nīrmōc” for nīmrōc” (half mid-day,) &c., &c. Perhaps such transposition of letters in the present case may be the result of “a proverbial” alliteration of the name of their chief town now called Bulaida, but which may have been first called Budaila *i.e.*, town of Budail, thus “Budaila bulaida,” *viz.*, Budaila is “a little town” (*bulaida* being the diminutive of *balda* “a town”); compare later on “*Balōc badrōc*” or “*Balōc Gadrōc.*” Budail of the Bajalī tribe, sent from ‘Almān by Al Hajjāj, A. H. 86-96 against Sināh and killed there by the enemy, may have been the founder of “Budaila bulaida,” but Budail is a common Arab name.

As before stated Arab historians mention a people called قفص *Qufṣ* or كفج *Kufij* inhabiting mountains to the south of Kirmān, called the mountains of قوص *Qufṣ*, somewhat to the south-east of which the low-lying country was inhabited by a people called the Balūṣ or Balūj = the Baloch. Some of the later historians have given كوج *Kūj* or Kōj as the Persian rendering of قفص *Qufṣ*. As, however, I met, at Sadech, a tribe who believed themselves to be aborigines, of whom there are many in Bashkard to the south of Kirmān, whose principal habitat is the mountain range of Gōkō in Bashkard, about 30 miles from the seacoast (the highest range in Balochistān, *viz.*, 7,000 feet) and who call themselves *Kufish* كفش, or *Kufic* كفج, *Kufij* كفج, or *Qufṣ* قفص I think that the قفص *Qufṣ* of Bilāthuri, Tabarī (who also gives كفج *Kufij*), and Ibn Haukal are the correct readings. It is easily seen that قفص or كفج if badly written in Arabic characters, would very likely be copied as قفص and كوج both of which are given as alternative readings, and by ‘Abu-l-fidā the last explained as the Persian equivalent of the first. I leave it to more competent authority to decide whether Kōfish, Kōfic, Kufij, Kūs, Kūj or Kōj, Kūi, Kēc, Kōc, Kīj, Kēj, Kiz, Kish, Cash and Cush, the son of Ham, are simply variations of the same name or not. I would now suggest an identification of the “Paricanii” of Herodotus, with a tribe called the “Purki,” the plural of which would be Purkiānii, Paricanii, *i.e.*, perhaps, “Vehrkan” of the Zend and “Varkān” of ancient Persian. They dwell to the north of Kech in the locality assigned to the Paricanii in our maps, and I submit that the identification of them with the Parikanii (Paricanii) is on etymological grounds preferable to that of the Brahui with the Parikanii, though “Varkān” and “Ba-rohi” may both mean “hillmen,” and I take it that (as al-

ready suggested by Professor Rawlinson), while the latter are distinctly Cushite, the former are possibly Turanian or probably Iranian, living side by side. The Purki are few in number, believe themselves aboriginal, and claim no connection with the Rinds.

With regard to the name "Baloch" I would also hazard a suggestion which, if it contains an element of truth, some better philologist than myself may perhaps uphold. It is this—whenever I have enquired of the "Baloch" the *meaning* of their name, they have *invariably* replied (as if the expression were proverbial) "*Balōc Badrōc*" (*Badrōsh* in some parts of the country). *Bad* means "evil," "bad" "ill," and *rōc* or *rōsh* means "day" (*rūz* is the modern Persian pronunciation). *Gad* in Pehlevī or Zend (ancient Persian) is equal to and synonymous with *bad* in Balochi or more modern Persian, therefore *Badrōc* or *Badrōsh* or *Bādrōṣ* in Balochi is equivalent to *Gadrōc* or *Gadrōsh* or *Gadrōs* of the more ancient Pehlevī or Zend, and to *Gadros-ii* or *Gedros-ii* of the Greeks. *Badrōc*, from the interchangeability of the liquids "r" and "l", is equivalent to *Badlōc*, out of which the "d" must naturally drop, leaving *Balōc* equivalent to "the *Gedros-ii*." If the derivation of *Balōc* from *Gadrōc* in the manner suggested be considered philologically inadmissible, then we may suppose that the proverbial expression *Balōc badrōsh* was current in the time of the Greeks, only that it was pronounced in those days *Balōc gadrōsh*, and that the Greeks wrote down the epithet for the name, which in such case would undoubtedly have been derived from Belus (or Balochis.) Note that *Sīstān* was called *Nīmrōc* "half day."

The suggestions made in the foregoing paper are, I wish it to be understood, tentative suggestions only, put forward, together with the arguments in support of them, in the hope of stimulating enquiry into the earlier history of Balochistan and of the various clans now and in times past inhabiting it (such page in the world's history being at present almost blank) and not as authoritative conclusions. It is probable that my suggestions that the Rinds, Marrīs, and other clans who now claim to be the "pur sang" of the Baloch, are not Baloch at all, may find many warm dissentients, but it will be necessary at any rate for such dissentients to define whom they call Baloch and give a derivation of the name; to offer a more plausible one than I have ventured on, *viz.*, *Balōc*=*Gadrōs*; to trace back to Aleppo the Rinds and other clans claiming to have migrated thence; and to explain away the statements of Firdusī and other authors that certain Baloch clans, *named by them*, and who still exist in the country under the same names, had their habitat in *Makrān* long before the Muḥammadan era.